

The flatness of the Universe is robust

Matts Roos & S. M. Harun-or-Rashid

Department of Physics, Division of High Energy Physics
University of Helsinki, Finland.

The flatness of the Universe is measured by the combination of parameters $\Omega_0 = \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda$. Here Ω_m is the dimensionless density parameter of gravitating matter comprising baryons, neutrinos and some yet unknown kinds of dark matter, Ω_Λ is the density parameter of vacuum energy, related to the cosmological constant Λ by $\Omega_\Lambda = \Lambda/3H_0^2$, and H_0 is the Hubble constant, usually given in the form $H_0 = 100h \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. A flat universe is defined by the condition $\Omega_0 = 1$.

There are many observations contributing information on Ω_0 . Although some results may be affected by unknown systematic errors rendering published errors of specified significance dubious, it is still of interest to know what combined value they determine for Ω_0 at present. In a sequence of reports (Roos & Harun-or-Rashid 1998, 1999, 2000) we have combined all published observations quoting a value and an error in a least-squares fit assuming all the errors to be Gaussian. This method excludes the use of many interesting analyses quoting only limits.

Before the advent of the two very recent balloon experiments BOOMERANG (de Bernardis & al. 2000, Lange & al. 2000) and MAXIMA-1 (Balbi & al. 2000) our most recent fit (for details see Roos & Harun-or-Rashid 2000) used 9 constraints: parametrizations of earlier CMBR data (Lineweaver 1998, Tegmark 1999) marginalized to the $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda)$ -plane, the cluster mass function combined with the linear mass power spectrum in Ly α data (Weinberg & al. 1999), X-ray cluster evolution data (Bahcall, Fan and Cen 1997, Eke & al. 1998), constraints from 14 classical double radio galaxies (Daly, Guerra & Wan Lin 1998), the SN Ia data (Riess et al. 1998, Perlmutter et al. 1998, 1999), and analyses of the power-spectrum of extragalactic objects (Broadhurst & Jaffe 1999, Roukema & Mamon 1999). All these constraints represent different functions of Ω_m and Ω_Λ , not functions simply of Ω_0 .

The result was then

$$\Omega_0 = \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda = 0.94 \pm 0.14 \quad (1)$$

(or ± 0.21 for the two-dimensional fit).

The total χ^2 was 4.1 for 7 degrees of freedom, much too low for statistically distributed data. From this we can conclude that the various errors quoted for the nine constraints are not statistical: they have been blown up unreasonably by added systematic errors, and there is no motivation for blowing them up further by adding more arbitrary systematic errors (as is often advocated by the referees of our papers). The true statistical error should be of the order of 0.15 to 0.18.

Let us now turn to the new balloon data. BOOMERANG observes (de Bernardis & al. 2000) that the position of the first multipole peak occurs at $\ell = 197 \pm 6$ which corresponds to

$$\Omega_0 = (200/\ell)^2 = 1.03 \pm 0.06 . \quad (2)$$

This value is very weakly dependent on a large number of parameters which mostly get determined by the shape of the multipole spectrum above the region of the first peak (Lange & al. 2000).

Let us make a statistical comment to the above BOOMERANG value. It has already been hailed in the literature as a proof that the Universe is closed. But nobody can escape statistical fluctuations (which do not reflect the quality of an experiment), therefore it is prudent to say that the true value of the peak is unknown, but with 68% probability it lies in the range between 0.97 and 1.09.

It should therefore not have come as a surprise that the MAXIMA-1 experiment (Balbi & al. 2000) reported $\Omega_0 = 0.90 \pm 0.15$, where the error corresponds to a 95% confidence range. We convert this to a 68% error, thus

$$\Omega_0 = 0.90 \pm 0.08 . \quad (3)$$

Averaging the values (1), (2) and (3) we find

$$\Omega_0 = 0.97 \pm 0.05 . \quad (4)$$

The two balloon experiments have clearly reduced the combined error dramatically, but the central value is robust, almost unchanged. One concludes that the Universe is flat to a very good precision, and one can take the robustness as a good indication of the trustability of the simple χ^2 method.

References

- Bahcall N.A., Fan X., Cen R., 1997, ApJ 485, L53
Balbi A., et al., 2000, astro-ph/0005124
Broadhurst T., Jaffe A.H., astro-ph/9904348
Daly R.A., Guerra E.J., Wan Lin, astro-ph/9803265
de Bernardis P., et al., 2000, Nature 404, 955
Eke V.R. et al., 1998, MNRAS 298, 1145
Lange A.E., et al., 2000, astro-ph/0005004
Lineweaver Ch.H., 1998, ApJ 505, L69
Perlmutter S et al., 1998, Nature 391, 51; 1999, ApJ 517, 565
Riess A.G. et al., 1998, AJ 116, 1009
Roos M., Harun-or-Rashid S.M., 1998, A&A 329, L17
Roos M., Harun-or-Rashid S.M., 1999, Proc. HEP'99, IOP Publishing
Roos M., Harun-or-Rashid S.M., 2000, astro-ph/0003040
Roukema B.F., Mamon G.A., 1999, astro-ph/9911413
Tegmark M., 1999, ApJ 514, L69
Weinberg D.H. et al., 1999 ApJ 522, 563